

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Vignia 22313-1450 www.nspto.gov

PPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/768,732	01/24/2001	Wayne W. Wang	13160US02	1228
7	590 08/13/2003			
Christopher C. Winslade McAndrews Held & Malloy 500 W. Madison Street			EXAMINER	
			NGUYEN, CAO H	
Suite 3400 Chicago, IL 60661		•	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2173	
			DATE MAILED: 08/13/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

J

M

Office Action Summary

Application No. 09/768,732

Applicant(s)

Wang et al.

Examiner

Cao (Kevin) Nguyen

Art Unit **2173**



The MAILING	DATE of this communication appears	on the cover sheet with the correspondence address		
Period for Reply				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.				
 Extensions of time may be av mailing date of this communic 		no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the		
 If the period for reply specifie If NO period for reply is specified Failure to reply within the set 	ed above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within th ified above, the maximum statutory period will apply a tor extended period for reply will, by statute, cause th fice later than three months after the mailing date of t	ne statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. are application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). his communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any		
Status				
1) 💢 Responsive to	communication(s) filed on Jan 24, 2	001		
2a) This action is F	FINAL. 2b) 💢 This act	ion is non-final.		
3) Since this appli closed in accor	ication is in condition for allowance erdance with the practice under <i>Ex par</i>	except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is reference Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.		
Disposition of Claims	•			
4) X Claim(s) <u>1-26</u>	1	is/are pending in the application.		
4a) Of the above		is/are withdrawn from consideration.		
_		is/are objected to.		
		are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.		
Application Papers		-		
9) The specification	on is objected to by the Examiner.			
10) X The drawing(s)	filed on is/are	a) 💢 accepted or b) 🗆 objected to by the Examiner.		
		rawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).		
		is: a) \square approved b) \square disapproved by the Examiner.		
	prrected drawings are required in reply t			
12) The oath or de	claration is objected to by the Exami	ner.		
Priority under 35 U.S.C				
13) Acknowledgen	nent is made of a claim for foreign pr	iority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).		
a) □ All b) □ So	ome* c)□ None of:			
1. Certified	copies of the priority documents have	e been received.		
2. Certified	copies of the priority documents have	e been received in Application No		
3. ☐ Copies of ap	the certified copies of the priority dopplication from the International Burea	ocuments have been received in this National Stage au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).		
	detailed Office action for a list of the			
_	nent is made of a claim for domestic			
	on of the foreign language provisional			
	nent is made of a claim for domestic	priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.		
Attachment(s) 1) X Notice of References Cited	4 /PTO 903)	W. [7]		
<u></u>		4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s).		
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 6) Other:				
	-1-, 1 of 1 abor 110/0/1	-,		

Page 2

Application/Control Number: 09/768,732

Art Unit: 2173

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103© and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

2. Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jamtgaard et al. (US Patent No. 6,430,624 B1) in view of Sugiarto et al. (US Patent No. 6,278,449).

Regarding claim 1, Sugiarto discloses an apparatus for the generation and application of a set of rules to transform source content into result content for a content receiving device, the apparatus comprising a source content area for retrieving the source content (see col.3, lines 24-57); an analyzer for identifying separate elements within the source content and assigning an identifier to each element; a result content area providing selective placement of the elements according to a desired layout (see col. 4, lines [11-59); and an application device for applying the transformation rules to the source content that is requested by the content receiving device (see col. 6, lines 11-65). However, Sugiarto fails to explicitly teach a rule generator for generating a set of transformation rules for transforming the source content into the result content according to their selective placement.

Jamtgaard teaches a rule generator for generating a set of transformation rules for transforming the source content into the result content according to their selective placement (see col. 4, lines 34-67 and col. 5, lines 27-67). It would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a rule generator for generating a set of transformation rules for transforming the source content into the result content according to their selective placement as taught by Jamtgaard to the webpage source content of Sugiarto; in order to delivery other types of Webpage content to devices having different input/ouput and to enhance a user friendly.

Regarding claim 2, Sugiarto discloses wherein the source content area and result content area are part of a graphical editing tool (see col. 7, lines 48-67).

Regarding claim 3, Sugiarto discloses wherein editing tools provide for graphical placement of source content from the source content area into the result content area as result content (see col. 4, lines 12-54).

Regarding claim 4, Jamtgaard discloses wherein a storage device is used to store the transformation rules for access by the application device. (see col. 5, lines 27-67).

Regarding claims 5 and 6, Jamtgaard discloses wherein the server device is a proxy server device that receives a request for source content, retrieves the source content from a corresponding web server device, and transforms the source content to result content according to the transformation rules (see col. 7, lines 13-67 and col. 8, lines 1-54).

Regarding claims 7 and 8, Jamtgaard discloses wherein the graphical editing tool is running on a design station device; and wherein the design station device is in communication with the application device in order to provide the transformation rules (see col.13, lines 19-50).

Regarding claim 9, Surgiato discloses wherein the source content and result content includes web page information, and the content receiving device is a web enabled device (see col. 20, lines 20-67).

Claim 10 differs from claim 1 in that "a web page editor running on the at least one design station, whereby a source web page is retrieved and the layout of a result web page is

formed according to the different device capabilities; and a rule generator associated with the web page editor for generating a set of transform rules to convert the source page to the result page, the transform rules being communicated to the at least one proxy server device, wherein the web enabled devices request information from the at least one web site through the at least one proxy server which applies the transform rules to the requested information" which read on Jamtgaard (see col. 14, lines 4-67 and figures (2-3)).

As claims 11-13 are analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claims 5-10 above.

Claim 14 differs from claims—1—and—10—in-that—a-first-display area for displaying the source content; a second display area for displaying the result content, a set of graphical tools whereby the source content can be graphically moved with the tools from the first area to the second area to form a result layout which read on Jamtgaard (see col. 17, lines 22-67 and col. 18, lines 1-40).

As claims 15-18 are analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claims 5-10 and 14 above.

Regarding claims 19-21, Jamtgaard discloses wherein the communication includes a network link; and wherein the network link includes the Internet; and wherein the communication includes a wireless link (see figures 2-5).

Claim 22 differs from claims 1, 10 and 14 in that "arranging result information content from the source information content according to the capabilities of the receiving device;

generating transformation rules according to the transformation between the source information content and the result information content; and applying the appropriate transformation rules to the source information content when the content is requested by the receiving device." which read on Jamtgaard (see figures 4-6).

As claims 23-26 are analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claims 5-10, 14 and 22 above.

Conclusion

3. The prior art made of record-and-not-relied-upon-is-considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. (PTO-892).

Response

4. Responses to this action should be mailed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231. If applicant desires to fax a response, (703) 308-6306 may be used for formal communications.

Please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT" for informal facsimile communications. For after final responses, please label "AFTER FINAL" or "EXPEDITED PROCEDURE" on the document.

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA. Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Inquires

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cao (Kevin) Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 305-3972. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 am to 6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John W. Cabeca, can be reached on (703) 308-3116. The fax number for this group is (703) 746-7240.

Any inquiry of a general nature of relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

CAO (KEVIN) NOUYEN PRIMARY EXAMINER

August 06, 2003

D'TATES OF